DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 949 AC 014 116

AUTHOR	Brown, Edward B.; Dutton, Donnie
TITLE	The Summer of 72: An Assessment of the Adult Basic Education Institutes in Tennessee, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Credit Courses; Data Collection; Evaluation Methods; Guidance Counseling; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Instructional Materials; Material Development; *Participant Characteristics; Participant Satisfaction; Professional Personnel; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	Kropp Verner Evaluation Scale; *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Three 2-week Adult Basic Education (ABE) Institutes were conducted in Tennessee during the summer of 1972. The three were an ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute, an ABE Materials and Teaching Institute, and an ABE Reading Institute. Each institute consisted of approximately 30 participants from the various regions of the state, and graduate credit was given for successfully completing each institute. The institutes served as teacher-training sessions, with the participants expected to conduct regional in-service workshops during 1972-1973 to disseminate information obtained in the institutes. Each of the institutes is discussed in some detail, with such facets as objectives, material covered, personnel used to facilitate learning, participants, and evaluation presented. The overall finding was that the three ABE institutes were successful. The appendix provides a copy of the evaluation form completed by the participants, as well as a copy of the Kropp-Verner Evaluation Scale. (DB)

THE SUMMER OF 72

By

EDWARD B. BROWN
GRADUATE ASSISTANT
ADULT EDUCATION
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

AND

DONNIE DUTTON
PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR
ADULT EDUCATION
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION INSTITUTES IN TENNESSEE, 1972

DECEMBER, 1972
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

AC014116

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. Charles Kerr, Coordinator of Adult Education, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, for his guidance and support, without which this study could not have been completed.

To Mr. Luke Easter, Mr. Charles Holt, Dr. James Farrell, Dr. Toni Powell, Mr. Charles Bates, Dr. John Peters, and Mr. Billy Glover, a special vote of thanks is offered for their assistance in data collection and for other information furnished that was included in this document.

Appreciation is expressed to Memphis State University, the Southern Regional Educational Board, the Tennessee State Department of Education, Tennessee State University, and the University of Tennessee for financing the Adult Basic Education Institutes and this study.

Finally, the authors are indeed grateful to Mrs. Dorothy Rowe, Adult Education Stenographer, Memphis State University for the typing of the manuscript.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION DESIGN 1

II. GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING. 5

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

III. MATERIALS. 18

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

IV. READING. 30

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

V. COMBINED EVALUATION OF INSTITUTES. 42

Profile of Participants
Physical Facilities
Objectives
Program
Overall Rating

VI. SUMMARY. 45

Appendix

SAMPLE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT 47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

If, indeed, a paramount belief in adult education is a recognition of the dignity of man and his right and need to develop his maximum potential, then all of life is learning, and adult education no longer can be viewed as a convenience but must be seen as a social necessity. Only by developing the hidden resources of adults can the ineffectiveness of our society be erased and the effectiveness be fostered; therefore, the key to adult education rests on the understanding of adults. With the key to success predicated on the understanding of the educationally disadvantaged adults in Tennessee and with most of the personnel in adult education having been trained primarily in other fields of education, one must work on the premise that good administrators, supervisors, and teachers are made and not born. The development of trained personnel can be accomplished only through a plan for adequate staff development, using better understanding and cooperation between the State Department of Education, local school systems, institutions of higher learning, and all persons concerned with adult education in Tennessee.

A Staff Development Committee was appointed in 1970 to study and implement methods by which better trained adult educators in Tennessee could evolve. This committee is composed of the State Department of Education's Adult Education Staff (five members), university adult

educators (four members, including one from Memphis State University, two from Tennessee State University, and one from the University of Tennessee), and local teachers and supervisors (six members representing the geographical regions of the State--East, Middle, and West). During the past two years, through the recommendations of the Staff Development Committee and the State Coordinator of Adult Education, most of Tennessee's ABE personnel have received instruction directly related to their various roles in adult education in the State.

With the success of the last two years evident, there still was the need within the State for more ABE training. This need was expressed by ABE teachers while attending various regional in-service meetings in 1971-72. Based on this input, a plan for the implementation of more intensive training was developed. This plan consisted of two phases. Phase I included the conducting of three, two week, credit institutes during the Summer of 1972, while Phase II included the conducting of regional in-service workshops across the State during 1972-73 to disseminate the information the Institute participants learned to the remainder of Tennessee's ABE personnel.

The salient points of Phase I, the concern of this document, were as follows:

1. An ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute was conducted at Tennessee State University, June 12-23, 1972; an ABE Materials and Teaching Institute was conducted at Memphis State University, July 3-14, 1972; and an ABE Reading Institute was conducted at the University of Tennessee, July 17-28, 1972.

2. Each institute consisted of approximately thirty participants from the various regions of the State and graduate credit was given to those successfully completing each institute.

3. Each institute served as a teacher-training session with the participants to be used for further dissemination of knowledge in local workshops across the State during 1972-73.

Evaluation Design

As the Institutes were conducted and concluded, the responsibility for ascertaining the gain in knowledge, based on behavioral objectives, on the part of the participants fell to the Institute Directors, as they were responsible for assignment of grades. Consequently, this document was confined to presenting evidence of the overall effectiveness of the Institutes attitudinally.

The participants attending the three Institutes comprised the subjects for this study. The selection of these participants was the responsibility of the State Department of Education.

The instruments used to collect data consisted of a questionnaire developed by the writers and an evaluation scale developed by Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner.[1] The questionnaire was designed to acquire demographic data and the reactions of the participants to the various aspects of the Institutes. The Kropp-Verner Scale, a widely used and valid instrument according to its authors, consists of twenty items arranged in rank order of value, with item number one being the best that could be checked, item number two, the second best, and so on, with item number twenty, the least favorable. In the administration of the instruments, every possible effort was made to encourage blunt honesty.

Only arithmetical means and percentages were utilized since it

---

[1]Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner, "An Attitude Scale Technique for Evaluating Meetings," Adult Education, Volume VII, No. 4 (Summer, 1957), pp. 212-215.

was not the intent of the study to formulate generalizations or test hypotheses that could be applied to a larger population.

The discussion to follow will examine each of the Institutes in some detail. Such facets as objectives, material covered, personnel used to facilitate learning, participants, and evaluation will be presented.

CHAPTER II

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

The ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute was conducted at Tennessee State University, June 12-23, 1972. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. James Farrell, Director, Extension and Continuing Education, Tennessee State University, Dr. Toni Powell, Assistant Professor of Adult Education, Tennessee State University, and Mr. Luke Easter and Mr. Charles Holt, Middle Tennessee Supervisors of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education.[2] The predominance of the information presented in this section, except for the evaluation, was obtained from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

The importance of guidance and counseling for adults is an all too old acknowledged premise among adult educators; however, this antiquated recognition of the need has seldom led to the providing of adult students with the necessary guidance needed.

The average ABE administrator, supervisor, or teacher has a sincere desire to help the educationally disadvantaged students achieve; however, despite his intentions, often, he does not relate effectively to his students. Much of the ineffectiveness can be traced to responses made unconsciously, rather than consciously; consequently, he is often

---

[2]All of the Institutes were conducted under the supervision of Mr. Charles Kerr, Coordinator of Adult Education, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, and his assistance is hereby acknowledged.

totally unaware of the effect his behavior is having on his students.

Before guidance and counseling can become a meaningful experience, the needs and problems of the adult student must be identified. Also included in this grid to effective guidance is the importance of the teacher becoming aware of his own attitudes, stereotypes, and feelings about adult students; realizing the effect these attitudes are having on his students; and attempting to deal, openly and frankly, with any attitudes he has which appear to interfere with meeting his students' needs.

The following appear to be some issues that need to be examined by the participants in the workshop:

1. Lack of understanding about the learning power of the adult student seems to be very prevalent among teachers. "You can't teach an old dog new tricks" is one of the most common ignorances expressed. The adult can learn equal to or better than the child, mainly due to his practical experiences, ability to think, his high level of common sense, urgent reason to learn, greater self-control, and use of his resources to a greater extent.

2. Lack of confidence in themselves in the educational setting is a problem for many adults. With society placing a stigma on the aging process, adults may have assumed their learning days were nearly over once they reached thirty-five. Extreme caution must be taken to assure the individual that the academic atmosphere does not contain the threats he so clearly remembers from his earlier years.

3. Today, poverty is seen as a stigma because a cure now exists for it--education; therefore, any man can raise his standard in life "if he wants to." The disadvantaged have tried to get an education and have either failed or been rejected by an educational system to which they cannot conform, through no fault of their own.

4. Memories are sometimes dangerous. The school room can mean punishment and failure to someone who remembers it in that way. A counselor or teacher in the adult learning situation often has the responsibility to aid the student in overcoming a negatively based memory.

5. The successful counselor is one who places emphasis on the student--his hopes, his goals, his dreams, and his potential; consequently, he never loses sight of the fact that his students are adults.

The needs above seem to dictate the following objectives:

1. To aid the participants in gaining insights into the ABE teacher-student relationship and the various and different ways teachers and students may perceive the relationship.

2. To assist the adult education teacher in developing greater empathy for the ABE student and his needs.

3. To assist the participants in analyzing existing ABE programs and counseling practices in light of their greater understanding of ABE students' needs and problems.

Learning Experiences and Staff

To facilitate the above objectives, lectures were conducted by consultants and small learning groups were formed. There was adequate time designed into the structure of the Institute to provide for feedback from the participants.

In addition to Farrell, Powell, Easter, and Holt, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Dr. Theodore Pinnock, Director
   Human Resource Development
   Tuskegee Institute
   Tuskegee, Alabama

2. Dr. Gerald C. Hanberry
   Program Coordinator
   Center for Adult Education
   University of Maryland
   College Park, Maryland

3. Dr. Lorenzo Wyatt
   Supervisor of Instruction
   Guidance and Counseling
   East Tennessee State University
   Johnson City, Tennessee

4. Mr. David Steward
   Director, Counseling Center
   Fisk University
   Nashville, Tennessee

5. Dr. Kenneth Smith
   Department of School Psychology
   Peabody College
   Nashville, Tennessee

6. Dr. George Cox, Director
   Pupil Personnel Service
   Tennessee State University
   Nashville, Tennessee

7. Dr. Charles Sams
   Director of Attendance
   State Department of Education
   Nashville, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute held at Tennessee State University:

Ray Baker
1826 Green Hills Drive
Nashville, TN 37215
615-292-2197

Raymond Blair
Route 2
Stewart, TN
615-289-4401

Edith Brooks
500 5th Ave. N.
105 Metro Manor Apts.
Nashville, TN
615-255-4086

Eunice Grisby
613 Young's Lane
Nashville, TN 37207
615-262-0523

Ed Brown
1782 Santa Clara
Memphis, TN
901-332-0823

Martha Hagher
Lakeside Drive
Lenoir City, TN
615-986-2940

Charles Draper
4324 Sneed Road
Nashville, TN 32715
615-297-9988

Henry L. Hardison
Route 3
Carters Creek Pike
Franklin, TN
615-794-3496

Nannie Driver
1018 35th Ave. N.
Nashville, TN
615-383-5352

Mattie Hayes
700 Cravens Street
Savannah, TN 38372
901-925-2951

Melvin Duke
Route 2
Manchester, TN 37355
615-728-2799

David Ronald Intram
112 Pomona Road
Petros, TN
615-483-4221

John Foster
1509 Taylor Street
Apartment B
Chattanooga, TN
615-624-4442

Jimmy Jordan
6727 Walsh Road
Millington, TN 38053
901-876-5612
615-269-0904

Jim Fuller
Executive House Q 309
Nashville, TN 37219
615-242-3212

Mary Jo Koory
1813 Cedar Lane
Nashville, TN 37212
615-269-0904

Johnny Larkin
Box 291
McEwen, TN 37101
615-582-3794

Hugh Ogletree
636 West 6th Street
Livingston, TN 38570
615-823-2333

Frances Looney
Route 1
Sparta, TN 38583
615-738-2939

James McKenzie
Big Springs, TN 37323
615-334-5937

Deotha Malone
229 S. Pardue Ave.
Gallatin, TN
615-452-5546

Sylvia Churl Malone
Route 1
Crossplains, TN 37049
615-672-3583

Mac Dee Moore
Route 3
Box 340
Clarksville, TN 37040
615-647-7193

S. H. Northcutt
Coalmont, TN 37313
615-692-3534

Nancy Officer
1811 Patterson Street #B
Nashville, TN
615-329-1318

Bobby Jean Ray
Route 2
Mt. View Road
Antioch, TN
615-793-5591

Robert M. Sharp
P.O. Box 308
Mason, TN 38049
901-294-4606

Connie Smith
325 Paradise Street
Gallatin, TN 37066
615-452-6611

Marie T. Sullivan
5499 Airline Road
Arlington, TN 38002
901-867-2430

Maggie Towns
170 East 5th Ave. N.
Huntingdon, TN 38344
901-986-5979

Jerre A. Vaughn
2726 Ennis Road
Nashville, TN 37211
615-833-5101

James E. Wright
595 Joyce Lane
Nashville, TN 37216
615-228-7638

Evaluation

The results of the evaluation, item by item, will be presented in this section. Interpretation of the data is left to the reader. The section will be divided into the following areas:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.

4. Program.
5. Strengths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (56.25 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (59.4 per cent).
3. The majority were white (53.2 per cent).
4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (51.5 per cent).
5. The majority possessed 1-3 years' experience in ABE (54.6 per cent).
6. Fifty per cent possessed more than 10 years' experience in ABE, with 37.5 per cent having 2-10 years' experience and 12.5 per cent having less than 2 years' experience.
7. Fifty per cent had public school experience other than ABE in elementary education, with 38.3 per cent having experience in secondary education and 11.7 per cent having experience in other areas of education.

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided in the questionnaire relative to the physical facilities, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[3]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. 4.3

---

[3]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

Comments:

(a) In general.

(b) The heat was unbearable, no fault of the staff.

(c) Came away with clear understanding of what we were studying.

(d) Ventilation insufficient for non smokers; seating uncomfortable.

(e) Adequate in blue and white room.

(f) I did not like moving around from building to building.

2. Adequate space was provided for small group meetings. 4.0

Comments:

(a) Groups were too close together.

(b) Counseling and guidance was beneficial and helpful in many ways.

(c) Inadequate table arrangements.

(d) Noise carried from one group to another.

(e) Need space for learning groups.

3. The accommodations for the participants were adequate. 3.7

Comments:

(a) Adequate, but men's hall was dirty.

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[4]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. 4.4

---

[4]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 3.

Comments:

(a) It made me realize a lot about myself and the ABE situation that I never thought of before.

(b) It gave us an opportunity for a better look at ourselves.

(c) Guidance and counseling are aspects which ABE requires of each teacher.

(d) I profited and learned the true meaning of guidance and counseling.

2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants. 4.4

Comments:

(a) In writing.

3. Adequate time was available for the objectives to be realized. 4.4

Comments:

(a) Structured organization would have damaged things.

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[5]

1. The content of the Institute was relevant to my needs. 4.3

Comments:

(a) I needed to be acquainted with my stereotypes.

(b) The viewpoints and impacts of some consultants resulted in negative reactions.

(c) Too much time on generalization.

---

[5]The ratings were based on the same scale as Footnote 3.

2. The program of the Institute was in line with stated objectives of the Institute. 4.3

   Comments:

   (a) Everything was tied together beautifully.

3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants. 4.6

   Comments:

   (a) Great.

   (b) Facilitators acted very well as liaisons for us.

   (c) Toni Powell, State Staff, and selected group leaders did a good job in this area.

   (d) Very good.

4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job. 4.2

   Comments:

   (a) I felt free to ask questions.

   (b) It raised a number of points that still need study.

   (c) Maybe (undecided).

5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job more satisfactorily. 4.6

   Comments:

   (a) I did not realize what my job was until now.

   (b) I will be able to do more for my students in the area of guidance.

   (c) I certainly hope so.

   (d) I am glad I came.

   (e) Anything dealing with ABE is helpful.

Strengths

The following strengths were listed by the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute:

1. Interaction between group and individual consultants.
2. Very good consultants; organization for the utilization of time was good.
3. The objectives that were set forth were covered to a great degree. The consultants knew their field and were very interesting.
4. Group dynamics used. We were never able to become bored because group participation took care of that.
5. Staff, excellent consultants, precise objectives.
6. The Institute was well planned, had expert consultants, materials to fit needs, and feedback from pupils.
7. I was able to learn more and receive a better understanding of the objectives. It was a dynamic source of inspiration.
8. The workshop made us more aware of general problems, needs, attitudes and feelings of the ABE students we teach.
9. Excellent in every way.
10. Cooperation and participation.
11. It enlightened our ways of thinking toward our students and their problems.
12. Interpersonal relations and small group cooperative activity.
13. Interpersonal relationship; consultants' point of view; ABE Students Day.
14. Developing better insight into the other person's needs and feelings. Good leadership and competent consultants. ABE students meeting with the group.
15. Consultants were stimulating. Group discussions caused critical thinking by all participants, especially about themselves.
16. Small group meetings where sharing of ideas and experiences proved enlightening.
17. Excellent consultants; relaxed and learning atmosphere; objectives were met; the attitudes of teachers attending.

18. Attitudes and needs of three geographical areas were opened up to this group.

19. Excellent agenda and goals were established; well organized; very realistic attempt to deal with acute problems of ABE.

20. Consultants, staff, participants, ABE students.

21. Consultants, group discussions organization. Dr. Powell did an excellent job.

22. The sharing of what others are doing in like situations.

23. It enabled participants to better see themselves in relationship to others.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute:

1. Too much time left to be filled with less important activities.

2. Lack of techniques to be used with the ABE student in counseling.

3. Parking space was rather remote for people of certain ages. The time 8 to 4 o'clock seemed tiring. Nine to 3 with one hour off for lunch would seem more feasible.

4. Too long. I would suggest 8 to 2 or 9 to 2:30 p.m.

5. Lack of materials to read; all persons to be housed together; more night fun activities; better food.

6. Parking.

7. The lack of free materials or samples of supplies we could use in our ABE classes.

8. Needed more people to study who were more common to our urban experiences.

9. Too short.

10. Too short; resentment of the university; poor consultants.

11. Too general in some discussions; need to interchange groups; too long--suggest 8-2 p.m.

12. A failure to clearly delineate some of the ideas under discussion.

Example: Talk about raising students to another level--Did we mean educationally, morally, financially, etc.

13. Lack of definite meeting place during first week was very difficult problem.

14. Some guest speakers seemed inadequate.

15. It was difficult for consultants to hold attention of participants possibly due to heat and seating.

16. Too short--extend one week.

17. Too much to cover in short time. Need four to six weeks.

18. Housing and the need to know each other better.

19. Parking.

20. Two of the instructors were not convincing to the class in their subject matter.

21. Physical setting in Home Ec Building.

22. Most of the consultants had nothing new to tell us.

23. Lack of air conditioned area.

Overall Rating

In assessing the overall effectiveness of the Guidance and Counseling Institute, two measures were needed. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, very low. The mean score given to this statement was 4.4 out of a maximum possible of five.[6]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to

---

[6]The rating was based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.51. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.51 placed the overall rating between items five and six on the scale, which means that there were fifteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only five more favorable ones above.

CHAPTER III

MATERIALS AND TEACHING

An ABE Materials and Teaching Institute was conducted at Memphis State University, July 3-14, 1972. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. Donnie Dutton, Professor and Director, Adult Education, Memphis State University, and Mr. Billy Glover, West Tennessee Supervisor of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education. Most of the following information relative to the Materials Institute, except for the evaluation, was taken from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

Adult basic education teachers are faced with the challenging task of helping adults improve their life style by assisting them in the development of previously undeveloped educational skills. Based on information gathered from ABE personnel across the State at regional workshops last year and/or information given to the State Regional Supervisors, two of the main problems identified were: (1) the selection and/or development of suitable materials for adult clientele; and (2) the selection of proper teaching techniques in various subject matter areas. Therefore, the objectives of the Institute were for the participants to develop the ability to:

1. Evaluate commercial instructional materials based upon recognized accepted principles of material evaluation.
2. Develop materials suitable for use in local ABE classrooms.

3. Use the commercial newspaper in the ABE classroom.

4. Use appropriate teaching techniques in the areas of reading, mathematics, and social studies.

5. Assist in the conducting of similar local workshops, on a limited scale, whenever scheduled for their geographical area.

Learning Experiences and Staff

To facilitate the above objectives, lectures were delivered by consultants, small learning groups were formed, and commercial materials were on display for the participants' convenience. Adequate time was available to provide for feedback from the participants.

In addition to Dutton and Glover, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Barbara Branch
   Math Consultant
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

2. Mrs. Sophia Brotherton
   Assistant Professor of Education
   123 Reading Center
   College of Education
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

3. Dr. Robert Geeslin, Director
   Educational Consultants Corp.
   581 Page Avenue N.E.
   Atlanta, Georgia

4. Mrs. Hazel Parker, Supervisor
   Adult Learning Centers
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

5. Mr. Victor Como
   Math Instructor
   Germantown High School
   Germantown, Tennessee

6. Mr. Tom Rakes
   Assistant Professor of Education
   123 Reading Center
   College of Education
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

7. Mrs. Carol Geeslin, Consultant
   Educational Consultants Corp.
   581 Page Avenue, N.E.
   Atlanta, Georgia

8. Mr. Don Tubbs
   Instructional Consultant
   Social Studies and Art
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

9. Mr. Blake Welch
   Director of Adult Education
   Memphis City-Shelby County Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Materials Institute held at Memphis State University:

1. Constance Marie Anthony
   219 South Benedict Ave.
   Oak Ridge, TN 37830
   615-483-7008

2. Myra Bryson Barnett
   97 McLin
   Humboldt, TN 38343
   901-784-5583

3. Bertha C. Barry
   838 E. Gage Ave.
   Memphis, TN 38106
   901-947-3785

4. George Wayne Bonnett
   Box 32
   Englewood, TN 37329
   615-887-5410

5. Joan Bryant
   1100 Perkins Terrace
   Memphis, TN 38117
   901-684-6573

6. Hughes Cheatwood
   601 Seventh Street
   Lawrenceburg, TN 38464
   615-762-3643

7. Robert W. Chick, Jr.
   3707 Whitland Ave.
   Nashville, TN
   615-292-4248

8. Mary G. Chorley
   P. O. Box 185
   Munford, TN 38058
   901-837-2122

9. Christine L. Corpal
   181 S. Parkway E.
   Memphis, TN 38106
   901-947-2346

10. Ida M. Coveyou
    104 Stanton Lane
    Oak Ridge, TN 37830
    615-483-8784

11. James M. Cunningham, Jr.
    3523 Perry Street
    Chattanooga, TN 37411
    615-629-4525

12. James Fleming Drummond
    4977 Lynbar
    Memphis, TN 38117
    901-685-6890

13. Nell Frances Hodges
    933 N. Willett Street
    Memphis, TN 38107
    901-274-0929

14. George W. Holmes
    1105 Shadowline Drive
    Memphis, TN 38109
    901-396-4932

15. Louise C. Jones
    274 Walker Ave.
    Memphis, TN 38126
    901-774-2538

16. Jimmie Lee Jordan
    6727 Walsh Rd.
    Millington, TN 38053
    901-876-5612

17. Helen Anderson Long
    212 St. John
    Clarksville, TN 37040
    615-648-2578

18. Betty Anne Mankins
    Route 2
    Athens, Tennessee 37303
    615-745-7908

19. Claudette Morrow
Route 6, Box 32
Somerville, TN 38068
901-465-3871

20. Hazel E. Parker
1896 Dearing Rd.
Memphis, TN 38117
901-682-4945

21. Charlotte G. Pryor
498 E. Davant
Memphis, TN 38106
901-946-1974

22. Juanita Ransom
Route 2, Box 113-6
Somerville, TN 38068
901-465-3012

23. Alida H. Scarbrough
334 Buena Vista Pl.
Memphis, TN 38112
901-275-0544

24. Margaret Marsh Sims
2509 Gardner Lane
Nashville, TN 37207

25. Linda Shaw Solomon
5196 Longmeadow Drive
Memphis, TN 38128
901-386-6571

26. Marie T. Sullivan
5499 Airline Rd.
Arlington, TN 38002
901-867-2430.

27. Margaret Thompson
5023 Truse Rd.
Memphis, TN 38117
901-682-2098

28. Glenn Johnson Weatherly
2659 Oakview Drive
Humboldt, TN 38343
901-784-5162

29. Anna R. Webb
168 Sixth Avenue North
Huntingdon, TN 38344
901-986-5905

30. Catherine Elizabeth Woodson
3410 Clarksville Hwy. A 4
Nashville, TN 37218
615-255-5552

Evaluation

This section will be devoted to presenting the results of the evaluation item by item. Interpretation of the data is left to the reader. The section will be divided into the following areas:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strergths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Materials Institute, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (70 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (56.8 per cent).
3. The majority were non-white (56.7 per cent).
4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (70 per cent).
5. The majority possessed less than 4 years' experience in ABE (56.7 per cent).
6. The majority possessed from 2 to 10 years' teaching experience in public schools other than ABE (56.7 per cent).
7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (53.6 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the physical facilities, with comments listed under each statement made by the participants and the rating of each:[7]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. 4.7

   Comments:

   (a) Too cold.

   (b) We were only crowded at the Learning Center.

   (c) Air conditioning was a little too cold for me personally.

   (d) The best I have ever been in.

---

[7]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

2. Adequate space was provided for small group meetings. 4.4

   Comments:

   (a) Tables for grouping better than just chairs.

   (b) We were often too crowded when we sat on only one side of a table.

   (c) Rooms where small groups could have met would have been desirable.

   (d) We did not need small group meeting space.

3. The accommodations for the participants were adequate. 4.6

   Comments:

   (a) Not applicable.

   (b) Accommodations were good, but we needed wash cloths and more linens.

   (c) Not adequate.

   (d) Poor service.

   (e) Except for telephone facilities--one phone in the building.

   (f) Fee collections were unfair.

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[8]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. 4.4

   Comments:

   (a) A few weak speakers in major subject areas.

---

[8]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 7.

(b) Materials seem to be limited in my situation because we are just beginning (3 years). I now feel that I can make recommendation for more and better materials.

2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants. 4.3

Comments:

(a) They were clearly defined, but not enough time was spent on the good materials under directed study.

(b) Especially in Geeslin's case; perhaps in Rakes' case also.

(c) On handout the first day.

3. Adequate time was available for the objectives to be realized. 4.1

Comments:

(a) Some areas could have been allotted more time.

(b) More time for making learning kits could have been used. Sophia Brotherton needed more time.

(c) I wish we had had another week on reading.

(d) There was enough time.

(e) I wish there could have been more time for interaction between participants; i.e., sharing experiences in small groups.

(f) We could have spent a week with Mrs. Brotherton and Dr. Rakes.

(g) Really had too much time.

(h) In general, yes, but some speakers were given too much time, others not enough.

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the

participants:[9]

1. The content of the Institute was relevant to my needs. 4.5

   Comments:

   (a) I plan to follow up on some of the speakers and their ideas.

   (b) Math and science not related to my situation except that I will try to take back what I gained to others in my system.

   (c) The informal opportunities to talk, the Learning Center visit, talks on math, social studies, reading during the second week were relevant.

2. The program of the Institute was in line with stated objectives of the Institute. 4.1

   Comments:

   (a) Half the good supply of materials was not discussed. Objective 5 was not specifically brought out; however, just by being in the workshop will be of value.

   (b) I wanted more on materials and especially teaching reading.

3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants. 4.5

   Comments:

   (a) There was no barrier between staff and participants.

   (b) I think staff made themselves available to us. I felt very free to converse with staff when I had a reason.

4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job. 4.4

   Comments:

   (a) Especially materials and using the newspaper.

---

[9]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 7.

5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job more satisfactorily. 4.6

   Comments:

   (a) I certainly will try.

   (b) I learned some good info about GED in particular.

   (c) I did not get all I needed. Need more on teaching subject matter.

Strengths

The following statements were listed by the participants attending the Materials Institute:

1. The participants, their spirit and interest, were superb.
2. Dr. Geeslin, Mr. Tubbs, and Dr. Brotherton.
3. Good rapport among participants and with staff. Examination of materials and learning center. Variety of activities to hold interest.
4. Opportunity for learning relevant information that I can use. Excellent participant relationship. Very competent resource persons, especially Mrs. Brotherton and Mr. Tubbs.
5. Application of principles being presented. Consultants answering specific questions asked by participants.
6. The greatest strength was in reading under Tom Rakes, Dr. Brotherton and Robert Geeslin. Dr. Dutton was very good as our director. Mr. Tubbs was fabulous.
7. Exchange of ideas among participants; enthusiastic speakers with good information.
8. Different people came in with different ideas. We had plenty of break time.
9. The unity of the group and our willingness to participate made the workshop. I give the Geeslins credit for this.
10. The staff was well prepared. Topics covered were adequate.
11. Space, speakers, materials, and content of conference.
12. This workshop was very good, inspiring and I really got something

from it. I do wish I could attend another one like it. The needs were met.

13. Excellent reading presentations. Excellent social studies presentation.

14. I think the overall strengths of the workshop was the teaching of reading for ABE students.

15. The lines of communication were opened between the group and all speakers. Informal atmosphere; however, learning was relevant.

16. Relevant to my needs.

17. Clearly stated objectives at the outset. Comments were welcomed and problems solved as participants showed interest or concern.

18. I think the reading experience we had under Geeslin was the best.

19. Communication of staff and participants. Covered objectives.

20. Bob and Carol Geeslin with their learning and applicable activities.

21. The reading part of the workshop was the best. The social studies presentation was very informative.

22. The presentation of the subject matter by the speakers. The reading part of the workshop.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Materials Institute:

1. The first week was devoted to the speaker's interest, and he was not flexible. Participants had to conform. This I consider a poor example.

2. Mathematics.

3. Not enough chance for sharing of teaching experience. Not enough time given to Mrs. Brotherton and Mr. Tubbs (excellent).

4. Some of the participants kept referring to day time teaching situations. Many times it did not relate to ABE.

5. The math and science was not good. I feel like it could have been handled better.

6. Failure to screen some speakers. Waste of valuable workshop time resulting in some superior speakers having too little time to present.

7. There could have been more group work.

8. I would have liked more time with some of the better speakers--Brotherton and Rakes.

9. There was not enough time allotted for reading per se.

10. Day too long; could have had shorter breaks and lunch hours, due to the excellent lunch room in the building.

11. Breaks too long. Lunch too long. Signs not provided for parking.

12. Not enough time provided for social studies.

13. Overall weakness of this workshop came from other speakers. Their information wasn't presented in an adequate manner.

14. The non-traditional ways of teaching.

15. Have one speaker, if possible, for each area so overlapping and confusion won't happen.

16. Lack of prior information as to what was to be covered in the Institute.

17. Math and non-traditional styles of teaching.

18. Non-traditional methods of teaching.

19. Math and non-traditional styles of teaching.

20. Non-traditional style of teaching was poorly done. The math part could have been much better.

Overall Rating

In assessing the overall effectiveness of the Materials Institute, two measures were used. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, very low. The mean score given to this statement was 4.5

out of a maximum possible of five.[10]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.11. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.11 placed the overall rating between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

---

[10]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

CHAPTER IV

READING

The University of Tennessee conducted an ABE Reading Institute, July 17-28, 1972. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. John Peters, Associate Professor, Department of Continuing and Higher Education, University of Tennessee, and Mr. Charles Bates, East Tennessee Supervisor of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education. Most of the following information relative to the Reading Institute, except for the evaluation, was taken from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

Adult basic education teachers are faced with the responsibility of teaching adults who lack sufficient reading skills to cope with society's demands. Reading is not only a singular topic meriting attention as a subject to be taught in adult basic education (ABE), but is also related to other subject areas within the ABE curriculum. If reading lies at the heart of the total ABE curriculum, it stands to reason that its principles and methodology should be mastered by ABE teachers and related to the mastery of all other curriculum content areas.

A large number of ABE teachers are experienced in teaching reading and have succeeded in teaching children to read. However, few have received sufficient training in teaching reading to adults. Moreover, most have not received refresher training for skills earlier developed in their professional education. Finally, little emphasis has

been placed on integrating the teaching of reading with other subject matter to be taught in the ABE curriculum. It is for these reasons that the overall objectives of the University of Tennessee Adult Basic Education Institute were for the thirty participants to:

1. Increase their understanding of the subject of reading as related to work attack and comprehension skills.
2. Develop skills in diagnosing reading difficulties and placing students in reading programs.
3. Increase their competency in the selection and evaluation of reading materials.
4. Develop their ability to incorporate reading skills into other curriculum areas in adult basic education.

Learning Experience and Staff

To facilitate the above objectives, lectures were presented by consultants and small learning groups were formed. There was adequate time designed into the structure of the Institute to provide for feedback from the participants.

In addition to Peters and Bates, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Dr. Leonard Breen
   Asst. Professor of Education
   Director of Reading Center
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee
2. Dr. Paul Burns
   Professor of Education
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee
3. Dr. Flora Fowler
   Asst. Prof. of Education
   Reading Department
   East Tennessee State University
   Johnson City, Tennessee
4. Dr. William Fowler
   Asst. Professor of Education
   East Tennessee State University
   Johnson City, Tennessee
5. Dr. Russ French
   Associate Professor of Education
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee
6. Dr. Tom Rakes
   Asst. Prof. of Education
   Reading Center
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

In addition, the following persons were used as group leaders:

1. Carole Brownlee
   3685 Coventry Mall
   Memphis Tennessee

2. Charles Cummings
   3854 Springfield
   Memphis, Tennessee

3. Joan Ford
   3854 Springfield
   Memphis, Tennessee

4. Johnnie Littlefield
   Route 3
   Lenoir City, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Reading Institute at the University of Tennessee:

1. J. B. Bolen
   Route 9
   Burnetts Creek Rd.
   Knoxville, TN 37920

2. Arlene Brewer
   105 Hillside Road
   Oak Ridge, TN 37830

3. Thelma Brow
   160 Fulton St.
   Alcoa, TN 37701

4. Bill Cathy
   5024 Longbranch
   Memphis, TN 38109

5. Dora Cody
   Sneedville, TN 37869

6. Margaret Cunningham
   Highway 100
   Fairview, TN 37062

7. Helen Green
   Route 3
   Bluff City, TN 37618

8. Eugene Lawson
   Route 1
   Jacksboro, TN 37757

9. Louise Hill
   Lakeside Drive
   Lenoir City, TN 37771

10. Earlie Mai Howard
    336 E. Paris St.
    Huntingdon, TN 38344

11. Marianne Jacumin
    Box 2395
    Clarksville, TN 37040

12. Mrs. Hannah Jaynes
    Ervin Hall Road
    White Pine, TN 37890

13. Netti B. Jones
    Route 1, Box 230
    Millington, TN 38053

14. Mary L. Kanipe
    3405 S. Fountain crest Dr.
    Knoxville, TN 37918

15. Marilyn Lamale
    113 Indian Lane
    Oak Ridge, TN 37830

16. Gloria C. Logan
    101 Cedar Hill Drive
    Waverly, TN 37185

17. Clyde May
Route 1
Jacksboro, TN 37757

18. Lois P. Morton
Route 2, Box 42
Bethel Springs, TN 38315

19. Charlotte Pryor
490 Duvant St.
Memphis,TN 38112

20. Brenda Richardson
3917 Thorton Drive
Kingsport, TN 37664

21. Rose Robbins
312 East Forrest Rd.
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

22. Robert Sharpe
Mason, TN 38049

23. Shira H. Shaw
1056 College #6
Memphis, TN 38106

24. Dale Sievers
TN State Prison
Station A West
Nashville, TN 37203

25. Ruby Sparkman
P.O. Box 5
Doyle, TN 38559

26. Eldon Smith
801 Cherokee Road
Johnson City, TN 37601

27. Kay Smith
2301 Green Forrest Dr.
Chattanooga, TN 37406

28. Rita B. Smith
Route 1
Surgoinsville, TN 37890

29. Susan Smithson
3700 Southerland Ave.
Apt. E-16
Knoxville, TN 37919

30. Ruth Tyrrell
8608 Gleason Drive
Knoxville, TN 37919

31. Rebecca Vines
4329 Grand Ave.
Chattanooga, TN 37410

32. Elaine Wilson
Chapel Hill, TN 37034

33. Verda L. Wilson
Route 1
Oliver Springs, TN 37840

Evaluation

This section will be devoted to presenting the results of the evaluation item by item. Interpretation of the data is left to the reader. The section will be divided into the following areas:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.

5. Strengths.

6. Weaknesses.

7. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Reading Institute, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (59.1 per cent).

2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (61.3 per cent).

3. The majority were white (74.2 per cent).

4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (71.1 per cent).

5. The majority possessed less than 4 years' experience in ABE (64.5 per cent).

6. The majority possessed more than 2 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (93.5 per cent).

7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (64.5 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the physical facilities, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[11]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. 4.4

   Comments:

   (a) I enjoyed all sessions both large and small.

---

[11]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

(b) Having a wing in the end of the building was great. The last two days we held our practicum across the hall, which was convenient.

(c) Poor physical environment, clutter, crowding, etc.

2. Adequate space was provided for small group meetings. 4.5

Comments:

(a) Small groups were very good.

(b) Splendid organization.

(c) More time needed.

3. The accommodations for the participants were adequate. 4.9

Comments:

(a) Dorm fees too high.

(b) Should get a place like Scottish Inns. It would be cheaper and better.

(c) Adequate, but too high.

(d) Agree.

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[12]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. 4.7

Comments:

(a) Very good.

(b) Was very helpful in meeting some needs.

---

[12]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 11.

2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants. 4.7

   Comments:

   (a) Very good.

3. Adequate time was available for the objectives to be realized. 4.5

   Comments:

   (a) For me they were, because I wanted and needed help.

   (b) A little more time needed.

   (c) Although the time was adequate, not all the presentations and practicums seemed to develop the objectives as completely as they could have.

   (d) I think the time was more than adequate.

   (e) Of course, it takes years to obtain the understanding that our speakers had.

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program, followed by the rating of each and comments made by the participants:[13]

1. The content of the Institute was relevant to my needs. 4.7

   Comments:

   (a) I feel that the conference fits my needs.

   (b) Practicums could have been more relevant.

2. The program of the Institute was in line with stated objectives of the Institute. 4.5

---

[13]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 11.

Comments:

(a) Dr. Fowler's presentation, although interesting, seemed to relate more to elementary education than to ABE.

3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants. 4.7

Comments:

(a) We were free to participate.

(b) Our group leader had to leave, and we were lost for a spell.

4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job. 4.6

Comments:

(a) I can use all the materials.

5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job more satisfactorily. 4.7

Comments:

(a) I have learned a great deal.

(b) I also feel that I have found many things which will help me in my regular classroom.

(c) I've only taught ABE one year, and it's been a learning situation for me as well as the adults with whom I work.

(d) Very definitely! Both in ABE and secondary education.

(e) Diagnostic procedures greatly appreciated.

(f) I am ready to go!

Strengths

The following strengths were listed by the participants attending the Reading Institute:

1. Well planned, good material sources (notebook, personnel).

2. Consultants planned well for us. No time lost.

3. Great consultants! Creative atmosphere for learning! Opportunity to find answers to specific questions or problems and opportunity to practice.

4. The workshop was organized to reach the objective as stated and did!

5. Adequate speakers. The objectives were carried out successfully. Materials (notebooks) were supplied in an organized manner.

6. In the field of reading, establishing diagnosis in teaching and developing the reading level, skills, and materials needed for me to go back to ABE students.

7. The greatest overall strengths were that it provided me with an insight into how to better teach my students, and it demonstrated ways to teach my objectives with materials.

8. Opportunities for meaningful interaction; Dr. Breen and Dr. French; attitude of staff.

9. The speakers were very good. The practicum groups gave us a chance to talk over problems with fellow workers.

10. The high instructional level.

11. In the small groups, we were given an opportunity to discuss similar problems. In the large groups, the time spent in making the materials and instruction applicable to our own situation was well spent.

12. Dr. Breen's presentation on Monday and both Fridays. Dr. French's presentation on non-verbal reasoning. Dr. Burn's presentation on teaching math.

13. The workshop was very helpful. I feel that I will be able to understand my ABE class.

14. I think the greatest strength was in the high caliber of most of the consultants. We also appreciated the genuine fellowship we felt with staff members. Dr. Burns, Dr. Breen, Dr. French, and Dr. Peters, have all been great.

15. The greatest overall strength in the workshop was Dr. Burns in the math area because of my own background in math in some areas.

16. The lectures of Dr. French, Dr. Breen, and Dr. Burns. Flora Fowler gave a lot of useful material in notebook.

17. Some of the consultants.

18. The objectives of the conference were met because of the excellent lectures and materials. I feel I gained much in content and procedures for teaching ABE.

19. Excellent consultants, especially Dr. Breen.

20. Diversity of opinion--expertise of consultants--relevance to my own teaching situation. Dr. Breen was excellent. Identity with other teachers with similar problems. Purpose was clearly defined and followed.

21. The content was relative to the needs of ABE teachers.

22. Small group discussions.

23. Reading, non-verbal communication, math, togetherness, and sharing ideas.

24. The speakers as a whole were very familiar with their topics and able to deliver.

25. I thought Dr. Burns' math program was one of the best and I hope it will be continued.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Reading Institute:

1. The practicum sessions need to be better planned.

2. Some of the lecturers were too soft spoken and boring.

3. The time spent on math was very short.

4. Repetition without continuity. Some consultants fell below their usual excellence.

5. This last week the practicums were not as valuable as during the first week.

6. Not a great weakness, but I did feel that the practicums sometimes became irrelevant.

7. Not enough time for rap sessions. Many of the participants had much to offer.

8. Group on practicums were totally pointless. Group leader seemed

unsure of the objective of the practicum and turned out to be a gossip session.

9. I felt that the fees for accommodations in the dorm was most inadequate.

10. The afternoon practicum sessions were too loosely structured, except for the afternoon spent with materials and the learning labs. I felt that they were rather undirected.

11. Not long enough.

12. The teacher participants! It seemed to me that a small per cent of our people came to criticize other people.

13. We wasted an afternoon cutting and pasting advertisements from a newspaper, and I failed to see the objective.

14. The sessions were a little long at one sitting.

15. I didn't get to know the people in the other practicums as well as I would have liked to know them.

16. Some consultants; meeting room; notebooks were clumsy and hard to manipulate.

17. The only complaint I have is that in my group practicums several times we were not allowed to complete our assignments because of personal wishes of our leader.

18. Time, display of materials.

19. In math the lectures were great. We needed more time to work out diagnosing disabilities. I especially wanted to hear Dr. Paul Burns teach memory skills.

20. A little too general at times.

21. I wish it could have been four weeks instead of two so that I could have learned more.

22. Inadequate leadership for small group for last week.

23. Seemed to be a breakdown between consultants and leader.

24. Too long lunch hour. Prefer the extra 30 minutes at the end of the day.

Overall Rating

In assessing the overall effectiveness of the Reading Institute,

two measures were used. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, very low. The mean score given to this statement was 4.7 out of a maximum possible of five.[14]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scales, was 3.03. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.03 placed the overall rating between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above it.

---

[14]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

CHAPTER V

COMBINED EVALUATION OF INSTITUTES

The purpose of this section will be to present the combined evaluation, item by item, of all three of the ABE Institutes--Guidance and Counseling, Materials, and Reading. It will be divided into the following sections:

1. Profile of participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the three ABE Institutes, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (61.3 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (56.7 per cent).
3. The majority were white (57 per cent).
4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (62.4 per cent).
5. The majority possessed less than 4 years' experience in ABE (60 per cent).
6. The majority possessed less than 10 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (58.1 per cent).
7. The majority of public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (54.9 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to physical facilities at the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[15]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. 4.5
2. Adequate space was provided for small group sessions. 4.3
3. Accommodations for the participants were adequate. 4.3

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives of the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[16]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. 4.5
2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants. 4.4
3. The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the Institute. 4.5
4. Adequate time was available for the objectives of the Institute to be realized. 4.3

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program at the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[17]

1. The content of the program was relevant to my needs. 4.5
2. The program of the Institute was in line with the stated objectives. 4.3

---

[15]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[16]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 15.

[17]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 15.

3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants. 4.6

4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job. 4.4

5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job. 4.6

Overall Rating

Two measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the three ABE Institutes. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. The value given to this item was 4.5 out of a maximum possible of five.[18]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institutes as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.21. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.21 placed the overall rating of the Institutes between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

---

[18]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Summary

It should be evident from a review of this document that the three ABE Institutes were successful. While there were problems, the overwhelming success of learning experiences makes those problems, in nature, appear minor or trivial.

Supplementary Information

Two other items of information were gathered on the evaluation forms that bear mentioning. One of these was whether the participants felt that additional institutes of this nature should be held in the future. All (100 per cent) participants said yes.

In addition to this, space was provided on the questionnaire for the participants to indicate subjects of concern to them that should be considered in formulating future institutes. The responses indicated no one outstanding predominance; however, specific content areas, such as reading and social studies, along with information in general relative to the adult learner appeared frequently; i.e., such things as recruitment, retention, guidance, and adult psychology among others.

APPENDIX

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
TENNESSEE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ABE MATERIALS INSTITUTE

PERSONAL DATA

1. SEX

_____Male

_____Female

2. AGE

_____Less than 35

_____35 and over

3. RACE

_____White

_____Non White

4. DEGREE PRESENTLY HELD

_____Less than Bachelor's

_____Bachelor's

_____Master's

_____Specialist

5. ACTUAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN ABE

_____Less than 1 academic year

_____1-3 academic years

_____More than 3 academic years

_____Not applicable

6. NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OTHER THAN ABE

_____Less than 2 years

_____2-10 years

_____More than 10 years

7. HAS YOUR EXPERIENCE, AS LISTED IN ITEM 6, BEEN PRIMARILY IN

_____Elementary education

_____Secondary education

_____Other (Specify) _____

8. PRESENT ABE EMPLOYMENT

_____Full-time

_____Part-time

9. PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

_____West Tennessee (Glover)

_____Middle Tennessee (Easter & Holt)

_____East Tennessee (Bates)

****

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. There are no correct or incorrect answers so feel free to express your feelings. Please give us your own opinion about these items by circling the answer that best describes how you feel. Also, a blank is provided after each statement for any written comments that you may care to make.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

10. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR LARGE GROUP MEETINGS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

11. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

12. THE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE PARTICIPANTS WERE ADEQUATE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

OBJECTIVES

13. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE WERE RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

14. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

15. THE PARTICIPANTS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

16. ADEQUATE TIME WAS AVAILABLE FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE TO BE REALIZED.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

PROGRAM

17. THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE WAS RELEVANT TO MY NEEDS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

18. THE PROGRAM OF THE INSTITUTE WAS IN LINE WITH THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

19. ADEQUATE LINES OF COMMUNICATION WERE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN STAFF AND PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

20. THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE WAS SUCH THAT IT ANSWERED QUESTIONS THAT CONCERNED ME RELATIVE TO MY JOB.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

21. AS A RESULT OF THE INSTITUTE, I FEEL THAT I WILL NOW BE BETTER ABLE TO PERFORM MY JOB MORE SATISFACTORILY.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

22. MY OVERALL RATING FOR THE INSTITUTE IS:

Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low

Comments: _____

_____

****

Please complete the following items:

23. Identify the greatest overall strengths of the Institute.

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Identify the greatest overall weaknesses of the Institute.

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Do you favor additional institutes of this type?

Yes_____

No_____

26. If you answered Item 25 yes, please indicate some of the topics that you feel would need to be covered.

_____

_____

KROPP-VERNER EVALUATION SCALE*

Please follow directions carefully: Read all twenty of the following statements. Check as many statements as necessary to describe your reaction to the Institute.

1. ____It was one of the most rewarding experiences I have ever had.
2. ____Exactly what I wanted.
3. ____I hope we can have another one in the near future.
4. ____It provided the kind of experience that I can apply to my own situation.
5. ____It helped me personally.
6. ____It solved some problems for me.
7. ____I think it served its purpose.
8. ____It had some merits.
9. ____It was fair.
10. ____It was neither very good nor very poor.
11. ____I was mildly disappointed.
12. ____It was not exactly what I needed.
13. ____It was too general.
14. ____I am not taking any new ideas away.
15. ____It didn't hold my interest.
16. ____It was much too superficial.
17. ____I leave dissatisfied.
18. ____It was very poorly planned.
19. ____I didn't learn a thing.
20. ____It was a complete waste of time.

*Dr. R. Kropp and Dr. C. Verner, Florida State University.

(If you wish, add any comments on reverse side of this page.)

ERIC Clearinghouse
FEB 6 1973
on Adult Education